

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/789,756	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LUDWIG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tiffany A. Fetzner	<b>Art Unit</b> 2859	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Amended

 (1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) John. A. Hamilton Reg. No. 48,946.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 February 2006
**Time:** 4:pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*Nabetani et al., US 6,348,794 B1 and Lian et al., US 5,804,969*
**Claims discussed:**
*1-8, 10-17, and 19-20*
**Prior art documents discussed:**
*See the PRIor arts noted on the attached PTO 892 Notice of References cited form.*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative, because the claims of the December 13th 2005 amendment and response, did not clearly set forth the applicant's inventive RF Multi-modal coil structure, in a manner which pre-cluded other multi-modal RF coil structures from meeting the claims, even though the applicant's drawings were clearly of a different structure than the prior arts or record. Applicant's representative agreed to the examiner amending the claims, in order to clarify the novel structural features, of applicant's invention, with respect to the other structural features shown. In order to provide clarification as to why applicant's multi-modal coil structure is a novel and non-obvious RF coil structure, over the multi-modal RF coil structures of the prior art. The examiner was thanked for her time and assistance, in mving the application forward towards allowance. No new matter was added by the examiner amendments made to the claims, because each of the amended limitations is clearly depicted in applicant's originally filed figure 3. .